three different times, and HARRY REID refused to even allow negotiators to be appointed. We appointed ours. People say Republicans shut down the House, shut down the government. We didn't do that. HARRY REID did that. He refused to even negotiate. It was his way completely.

He asked a question when the press was there. Not many of them reported on how ridiculous the question was. But he asked the question of, basically, what right do they, the House of Representatives, have to say what government programs get funded and which do not?

Well, I asked that exact question to four constitutional experts that testified before our Judiciary Committee today. One clearly was a defender of the Obama administration, yet all four of the witnesses—brilliant, constitutional scholars, even though we have our disagreements. These were brilliant people, and every one of them had the same answer for HARRY REID's question. The answer is the United States Constitution, article I, section 8. It gave Congress control of the purse strings, and it gave the House a little more control than the Senate. The Senate has got to go along with whatever legislation is going to become law.

But he asked the question, and I put this question to our experts: Suppose you were in a town hall meeting with constituents back in a congressional district and an elementary schoolchild asked the question, What right does the House of Representatives have to decide which government programs get funded and which do not? They unhesitatingly said the answer is our Constitution, article I, section 8. They all agreed. They all knew immediately.

So I have asked that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee make that testimony available to our dear friend, the Senate majority leader down the hall, so he won't have to ask that question to reporters who are not familiar with the answer. We can get it to him straight from some of the greatest constitutional minds on both sides of any aisle, and he will understand it is the Constitution that gives us the right to have a say.

For HARRY REID to shut down the government by saying you are either going to give us every dime that we demand or the government will be shut down is really outrageous. They shut the government down. We even gave them an out.

There is a wise Chinese saying that says, it is good to give your adversary a graceful way to exit. We gave the Senate majority Democrats a graceful way to exit by saying, Look, you don't want to completely defund ObamaCare; we get it. We think that is the best idea for America. Here is a compromise. Let's just suspend the whole bill for a year.

HARRY REID could have taken that and said, We don't want to do this, but the Republicans in the House are making us hold off on all of ObamaCare for a year. Gosh, golly gee, we didn't want to, but they are making us.

That was a graceful way that they could have exited. But they were so determined to shut the government down that, when we came back with another compromise passed out of this body, we said, How about if we do this? The President acted unconstitutionally. That became very clear in our hearing. For the President to say he wasn't going to enforce the business mandate in ObamaCare is unconstitutional. Not only is it unconstitutional, the President is directly violating his oath of office. He is required to faithfully defend the laws, see that the laws are carried out, and he announced he wasn't going to do it for a year. He doesn't have that kind of luxury.

Even in a spirit of extreme compromise, I didn't vote for it. I thought we shouldn't be compromising against ourselves. But a majority in here voted to send the bill, and we sent it down to HARRY REID and the Senate that said the President has decided to suspend the business mandate for a year. If businesses deserve a mandate for a year, let's do it for every individual in the country for a year. That gave HARRY REID another out. He was so determined to shut down the government, he wouldn't even bring that to a vote.

Then our final ultimate compromise in compromising against ourselves, without any Senate offer of compromise whatsoever, was to say here are our negotiators we are appointing. We voted for it. We sent the list of negotiators; you appoint yours. We will probably have a deal by 8 a.m., and we will not even have to have a real shutdown. But HARRY REID was determined to have a shutdown, and so he got a shutdown. Now there is no graceful escape because we have got to repeal ObamaCare. That is very clear, and I hope that we do that.

I see my friend from California. Actually, he is a very dear friend. We have been in some interesting situations worldwide as we stand up for our country and for the people of the United States of America, for truth, justice, and the American way. As my time is about to expire, let me say that I didn't vote for the patent bill in the Judiciary Committee. I have some real concerns about it, as I did the last one that I voted against.

□ 1715

I still believe in my heart we should not have changed 200 years of patent law from the first to invent being right, changing it to the first to file being right. I think the law was appropriate the way it was. We needed to make some reforms, but I think we made a glaring error.

Many people came to this floor and said we have got to pass that bill to deal with the issue of patent trolls, and now we have another bill that we are told will likely come to the floor tomorrow that this time it will really deal with patent trolls. There are some things in there that I like, and I am glad we are trying to deal with them, to help people that need to be helped.

You know, where a bank is utilizing a procedure that they paid for, they are not infringing on anybody's patents intentionally, and so to hold up people, you know, a small community bank that doesn't have a million bucks to spend on patent litigation, when they are innocent stakeholders, it just seems grossly unfair.

There are things we ought to do. But I am very concerned that we ought to be spending more time, let America help us get this bill right, and I am still hoping that we will wait, get more input so that we don't mess up the patent system any more than we already have.

My time is expired, or is about to, so I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper personal references toward the President.

THE CONGRESS THAT KILLED THE PATENT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my good friend, Mr. GOHMERT, for that heartfelt expression.

Yeah, there are problems at whatever area of government we look at. There are ways that we can improve it, but there are also problems in government that can be used as an excuse, as a cover for a power grab by very special interest groups in our country to change the law in the name of dealing with a serious problem.

Then what comes out of it has something to do with the interest of that special interest, rather than curing the problem. That is what is going on today when we deal, when we hear all of this talk about the patent system.

We must all ask ourselves: Do we want to be known as the Congress that killed the U.S. patent system which has served the American people well for 225 years?

Let's note that there are very powerful interests in this country. Mr. GOHMERT and I have been fighting them on a number of fronts. We call them globalists because what they are interested in is making sure that our economy and our rules and our rights are based in a global system that eventually will be run by the United Nations or whoever.

We have got multinational corporations trying to break down things like the patent law that have been unique to the United States and granted the American people many more rights than are granted to the people of other countries.

So, once again, we are talking about reforming the patent system. After 20

years of fighting on these issues, again, we have a salami approach by people, a lot of people who don't even believe in the patent system, who are trying to change the fundamentals of our system.

Well, just last year we passed the American Inventors Act, and it just went into effect earlier this year. Now we have patent lawyers, the courts, and inventors trying to figure out the implications of the changes of that last law from last year, and that was one of the most sweeping changes to the present American patent system that we ever had.

Why are we rushing into it now before we even know what the results are from the patent bill that was passed last year?

Well, even before we are able to judge the America Invents Act, this other patent bill is now being rammed through this House. Let me repeat that. It is being rammed through at breakneck speed, not giving the people on the outside—there are powerful interest groups that are pushing for these changes, because it will permit them, basically it will permit the big guys to steal from the little guys.

Yeah, okay. These big, multinational electronics companies want to steal from America's independent inventors. They are ramming their changes in the patent system through this House at breakneck speed so that people on the outside are not going to be able to notice what is going on and how it will impact them.

Well, the word is getting out. It is spreading out throughout America, whether it is our universities, or whether it is people in biotech or the pharmaceutical industries or the American Bar Association or small inventors throughout the country, people are beginning to notice the danger that we are in by this rapid movement of legislation through the system.

I wish I could simply focus on the bad provisions of this new bill, as I say, the Innovation Act, H.R. 3309, I call it the Anti-Innovation Act. That bill is expected to be on the floor in the next couple of days.

If the bill is bad, okay, the process now being used to get that bill through the system is—they are stifling debate. They are having such limited time that people aren't able to really go in and see what is involved in this bill.

Remember the last time when we actually looked at, we tried to pass a significant piece of legislation before people had really had a chance to examine it and look at it?

Well, having this bill rammed down our throats at such breakneck speed is even worse than the bill itself. In the one Judiciary Committee hearing—they only had one on this particular bill—witness after witness strongly recommended moving slowly, and warned of unintended consequences.

While it takes a few minutes to consider each provision of this bill, it takes only a few minutes to see that they are aimed—give them the benefit of the doubt that they are single, that there is a single thorn in the side of the mega-electronics companies that are behind this bill, and that is that you have small inventors who will come up and say you have violated my patent, long after they have just ignored the patent and went and used it anyway without the inventor's permission.

Well, that one thorn in the side of these mega-electronic companies, to get rid of that, they are willing to create much more pain in other industries, in our educational institutions, in researchers, especially pain for America's individual, yes, independent inventors.

In the rush to get H.R. 3309 on to the floor so quickly, there has not been a single full day, legislative day, that is, between the time this legislation passed the Judiciary Committee, which means that when it passes the Judiciary Committee, that is when it is available to House Members to consider and to submit amendments to the Rules Committee.

Well, there has not been one legislative day. This happened right before the vacation, right before we went off for Thanksgiving and, thus, we didn't have time, and everybody is off for Thanksgiving.

When are we going to get our amendments put together?

We were rushed into our amendments. I came down here 15 minutes ago because I was up in the Rules Committee, finally, where we put together some amendments to try to deal with the dark side of patent law and this patent bill that is going through.

So it is, as I say, going to create a lot more, a lot more pain for other industries, because we won't have had a chance to look at it and amend it, than it will do good for the electronics industry.

By the way, the electronics industry should be treating the small inventor fairly, and if someone has a legitimate patent and they have ignored it, they should pay that person damages because that person owns what he created.

Instead, what we have had is a society where these mega-companies are faced by an inventor and they just say, well, sue us; go sue me and see what you think.

What this bill does, of course, is make it much more difficult for the small inventor, the small inventor, to be able to sue because it creates much more, a much heavier burden on the small inventor.

So it seems that we have, if we have to pass this bill with such a rapid bill, we are going to have to pass the bill before we realize everything that is in the bill.

Well, that shouldn't be happening again, after the last debacle of ObamaCare, which now has turned into a disaster for our country. That is what is going to happen to the patent system, and the confusion that is going to happen when we rush in to passing legislation.

I am calling on my friends and colleagues who haven't had time to fully understand the implications of this legislation to join me in demanding a postponement, just a postponement of the vote to pass the bill until after this holiday season is over. That will give us time to consult with our own constituents, with experts, with inventors, and other people from other industries, rather than just these big electronics Google industry gang.

So we need to know what the real implications of the legislation are. So we need to what?

Postpone the vote. If you can't postpone the vote, kill this bill and start writing a new one and give everybody a chance to have their say, their input into the bill.

We are told that this bill is aimed at the threat of so-called patent trolls. You will hear that over and over again. These so-called villainous trolls are patent holders. That is what they are. A patent troll is someone who owns a patent, or a company that represents patent holders. They are engaged in defending their rights against infringement of those patents they own.

There are all of these implications that we are talking about invalid patents. No; we are talking about legitimate rights that were granted to the American people to own a patent that is in our Constitution, and these are legitimate patents.

But there is this aura, oh, the innuendo that these are abusive patents. What is an abusive patent?

It is when somebody like Google is using your patent and refusing to acknowledge that it is yours, and you have got to take them to court, and you are a little guy, and they will do anything to stop the little guys from taking them to court and winning.

These patents that we are talking about are just as valid as any other patent that is granted by the Patent Office, and these huge corporations—we are talking about people who have, quite often, intentionally infringed on a patent.

What that means is they have intentionally stolen the patent from a little guy who they don't think has the power, financially and otherwise, to enforce his patents through the court.

These huge infringers would have us believe that the patents that we are talking about are questionable, they are invalid or unworthy of being patented. Well, that is not the case. That is not what this bill does.

What this bill does is make it more difficult for honest and forthright people who are patent owners or independent inventors to enforce their constitutional rights of ownership.

The patents that are being targeted by the multinational electronics firms are legitimate, by and large, but they were the projects, these patents were the projects of small inventors who don't have the means to defend themselves.

Oh, but what makes these vilified patents different, by the way, than the good patents that are owned by these large corporations themselves?

Well, it is the so-called patent troll again. That happens to be a lawyer—and this is defined. A patent troll is a lawyer who takes on a case specifically to defend the little guy from theft. But the lawyer didn't invent it; he is only there for the money.

How shocking that we have lawyers who are defending clients only because the lawyer is going to make money on it. That is how our system works. That is what happens. You get lawyers to argue your case before a judge and get a fair hearing.

There is nothing wrong with having a lawyer decide that he is going to get involved and help a guy for a percentage of what the case results in and what the decision will be.

□ 1730

Being out for profit, even though the person did not invent the technology, is not in any way something that is disgraceful or bad. In fact, these lawyers have become a champion of little guys who don't have the resources to enforce their own patent, or they could be an individual or a company, or they could buy the rights from these small inventors.

And let me just say if the inventor is being cheated out of her or his rightful compensation, it is a good thing that there is a lawyer there or anyone else there who wants to invest in that to make sure that that inventor gets just and rightful compensation.

Now, I happen to have been very concerned about these changes in the patent law, and I have had meetings over the last couple of months; and I happen to have had a meeting with a very prominent businessman who was in the meeting when the term ''patent troll'' was originated. Surprise, surprise that the term patent troll was thought of by a group of business executives of how they could demonize those people who were suing their companies for infringement on the patent rights.

How were they going to do that? They knew they couldn't demonize the independent inventor, the small inventor. Americans think too highly of that. So they decided they would demonize the lawyers and try to divert the attention of the American people away from the issues at hand to try to undermine the ability of the little guy to make his case before the courts and thus demonize the lawyer who was representing him or the lawyer that had helped by taking on the case.

So that discussion took place. How cynical can you be. And the person who I was talking to said, And I suggested that we use the term ''patent pirate,'' but that wasn't sinister enough. So every time you hear the term patent troll, remember, it is a way to try to get you to think of a person that they are vilifying rather than the actual issues at hand. And the issues at hand are talking about theft by the big guys of the little guys, of the little guys' patents who can't afford to defend their own constitutional patent rights.

Now, I have spoken with independent inventors, conservative political organizations, the American Bar Association, industry groups like PhRMA and biotech. We have major universities today, an organization representing 2,000 universities, that have research projects within those universities, all of whom affirmed that H.R. 3309, the so-called Innovation Act, basically is a bad bill for them.

They understand that what we have got is big multinational, again, electronics companies behind us. But it may help those companies. I have no doubt about that. It will help shield them when they infringe on somebody's intellectual property, but it will hurt the rest of these people and the economy. Whether it is other industries or whether it is our educational institutions, I suggest that Members of Congress go back to their districts, give them a chance to go back to their districts, talk to their small inventors. Talk to the small inventors in your districts to see what they think about this poison patent legislation. See what the educators think about it. See about what the universities think. Think about people in major industries that employ hundreds of thousands of people like biotech and pharmaceuticals. Think about those things. Talk to those people, and you will find that there is a very limited number of people who are being helped by this bill, but a tremendous swath across our economy of people who are being hurt by it, not to mention the small independent inventors, the source of our competitiveness, the source that has made America secure, made the American people prosperous because now we can outcompete others because we are technologically superior.

No, the patent system has been too valuable for us to let one industry ram that through Congress with a flood of campaign donations that have been going on here for the last several years.

Proponents of this legislation, as I say, have demonized the patent lawyers just to draw attention away from the fact that these large companies have stolen someone else's patent-protected technology. So it is the big guys versus the little guys. And guess what, in order to beat the little guys, the big guys are now changing the rules of the game. That will hurt all kinds of people throughout the American economy.

H.R. 3309 should be called the Anti-Innovation Act. It is an aggressive attack on the ability of inventors to defend their ownership right to technology that they have invented. This is not about frivolous lawsuits, although you will hear that all the time—frivolous lawsuits and trolls. This is about all lawsuits. This is about all inventors, no matter how absolutely pure their motives are and their rights are clear. No, this will limit each and every independent inventor. This entire bill, every provision diminishes the ability of the small inventor to defend his or her creation. It is a cynical cover for creating for the big guys a license to steal from the little guys.

Former Patent Office Director Kappos and other former directors of the Patent Office have made it clear that we should move slowly and with great care in making such changes to the patent law. This legislation is too broad, its implications too unclear, and its effects unknowable. That is what witnesses and experts have indicated. That is what we hear from all around the United States from very significant players in our economy.

But that is not what is happening here in Congress. In Congress, this bill is being railroaded into passing; and this is right on top of the passage of last year's legislation, as I say.

So what is going on here? This is a heavy-handed attempt by mega-multinational corporations to diminish the viability of America's patent system. This has been going on by these very same multinational corporations to try to diminish patent protection in America. This has been going on for 25 years, and I have seen it over and over again. We have to fight this back.

They want to harmonize America's patent system with Japan and Europe, who have weak systems that do not protect the individual inventor. For example, they tried to foist off—we defeated this one—they have been trying to make it so if someone applies for a patent, after 18 months—this is what they do in Japan and in Europe—after 18 months, the patent application would be published, even though the patent hasn't been granted. I call that the Steal American Technologies Act. The same gang who tried to foist that on us years ago—every year they come up with a new change like that to diminish patent protection for the American people. That would have been the Steal American Technologies Act. Anybody who could have advocated that, it was so blatant that we were able to defeat it outright; and now we face this challenge.

According to the sponsors of H.R. 3309, this is, again, an attempt to combat patent trolls, even though there is a study that was mandated in that last bill that shows that Congress—this much heralded problem of patent trolls really isn't a major driver of lawsuits. And what has caused a new surge in lawsuits, interestingly enough, is that new legislation that was passed last year, while most of the provisions of the legislation will make getting involved in lawsuits more complicated, more costly, and more challenging to bring a lawsuit for a patent infringement.

What does that mean? That means if the little guy needs to fight for his rights in court, we are making it more complicated, costly, and more challenging for the little guy. Of course the big guys, they have got a whole stable of lawyers working for them.

And there you go. These people would restrict lawsuits that are totally legitimate in order to control a very few number of lawsuits that are manipulative of the system and thus are abusive. Rather than making it simpler, cheaper, and easier to defend against baseless accusations and thus reduce spurious lawsuits by strengthening the good guys, this bill is aimed at weakening the small inventors who are the ultimate good guys.

In addition, under the claim of ''technical correction,'' this legislation proposes the removal of the patent system's only judicial review process.

Listen to this: since 1836, every inventor has known that if they are mistreated by the government officials who run the Patent Office, if the decisions on their patents are made on criteria that is not legally established, they can go to court, and they can challenge that. In fact, as late as last year, the Supreme Court in Kappos v. Hyatt reaffirmed the importance of this judicial review. This bill takes that right away from the individual inventor.

The independent inventor who has had this right since 1836 now can't go to the court. He can't have his day in court if he has been treated illegally or wrongly. That is what is in this bill, along with a lot of other things. That is why the American Bar Association is opposed to this bill.

I would like to quote my colleague from Texas, Mr. LAMAR SMITH, former chairman of the Judiciary Committee and primary author of the America Invents Act, which was the last bill. Speaking of the new environmental regulations at the Science Committee just a few weeks ago, he said:

Our Founders made sure that the Constitution provides a means for the American people to obtain a fair hearing before impartial judges. This may be one of the most underrated rights Americans enjoy today, the right to judicial review. This proposal is an attempt to prevent judicial review. Americans deserve to understand exactly what this proposal would do and retain the right to challenge it.

Let me note that the gentleman from Texas has underscored the importance of having a judicial review of the actions of government employees, especially those in regulatory agencies. This principle applies just as certainly to patent review as it does to environmental regulations that the gentleman was talking about.

Now, Patent Office officials have requested that the judicial review be done away with. They want to do away with it, and that is why it is in the bill because they can say it is too burdensome for them to defend what they did as part of their job on the rare occasions when they are challenged in court. But it is just too burdensome for them.

Never mind that anyone who brings the claim to court is required to cover the costs. If someone is challenging them, they are going to have to cover their own costs. Well, the Patent Office just wants to strip away that right because Americans don't really deserve to have a day in court to challenge what government officials do because it is just too inconvenient for the bureaucracy.

The legislation we expect before the House this week is consistent with a decades-long war raged against America's independent inventors, which I have been talking about, and just this sort of arrogant attitude of the independent inventor is being taken for granted.

Let me tell you what the independent inventors have done. They have made our country secure. They have made our country competitive. They have made the American people—our industry is able to pay our people good wages because we are more competitive with high technology and good technology. Technology has helped save our country, and it created the American way of life. This bill would stifle, would kill American technological genius.

The provisions of the Innovation Act will impact every inventor in a negative way in America. The Innovation Act will create more paperwork when an inventor files for infringement claim, for example, which means somebody stealing and stuff—this will increase the cost to defend those rights and the potential, of course, if you have much more paperwork, then you give the court the ability to dismiss the case on technical requirements: well, you didn't fill out this technicality; you missed that in the law. So it is making it more costly and much more technically complicated.

The Innovation Act will impose rules on the Judicial Conference, meaning on our judges, which run counter to almost 80 years of established rulemaking process, whereby the courts have been establishing their own rules of procedure. Again, this law will dictate how the judges will make their decisions, and it is so definitive that it will complicate the process and could end up with less justice, not more, because the judges will feel compelled not to use their common sense.

If we want to get rid of the burden of litigation that is nonsense, you know, frivolous litigation, let's give the judges some more discretion in determining is this really what is meant to be protected by our law instead of having to dictate the very basis for every one of their decisions.

The Innovation Act will switch us to a ''loser pays'' system so the potential financial downside for a patent holder, meaning the little guy, increases dramatically. Thus we have a situation where the big guy, again, what does he care if he has to pay the legal fees for a little guy filing against him? But if the little guy loses and then has to pay for the legal fees of the big guy, massive, massive expense which will bankrupt him for life.

And the Innovation Act goes even further. It brings other people into that court and into that case.

□ 1745

In fact, people who have an interest in that patent, such as investing in the company or licensing the patent, can be brought into that ''loser pays'' court action and thus they would have to then pay the expenses for this huge corporation if that little guy loses.

Do you know what that means? Nobody is going to stand up for the little guy. They can't afford to take that risk. These big companies will squash them like bugs because they can absorb that kind of cost.

This is the disincentive for people to support the efforts of small inventors whose rights are being denied. Now they will be denied the support of third parties. They can call them trolls if they want. They can say that we are denying them trolls. They are denying somebody else coming in and helping the little guy who can't afford to make sure that these big guys are not stealing his invention and giving him no compensation.

The Innovation Act will create a new requirement that patent holders must, once filing a claim for infringement, provide information about all the parties. That means the infringer—these big guys—are going to get a list of all of their enemies. This is not consistent with American tradition where we believe that people don't have to put themselves at risk in order to help a good cause. This means the elimination of privacy in business dealings. The little guy is totally exposed, as his friends and suppliers will be totally exposed as well.

The Innovation Act, once this requirement has been invoked, will force the patent holder to maintain a new bureaucratic reporting requirement and a fee that goes with that.

Well, what does that mean? That means the little guy now has to keep books that he doesn't have to keep. His life is much more complicated because he has filed an infringement case. These are minor inconveniences to multinational corporations. They have bookkeepers. They have lawyers. This means the little guy is going to be smashed and is going to be smothered under the new requirements of this act.

The Innovation Act will enable large multinational corporations to create nested ''shell companies'' as customers, which have few assets but can infringe on patents for a decade or more, while an inventor, of course, cannot.

Let me just close, Mr. Speaker, by suggesting that we have the support of a multitude of interest groups in our country—educators, businesses, large corporations, and people in our country—who are opposed to this bill, which I will include in the RECORD, and I yield back the balance of my time.

WHO IS OPPOSED TO H.R. 3309?

Universities: Association of American Universities; American Council on Education; Association of American Medical Colleges; Association of Public and Land-grant Universities; Association of University Technology Managers; Council on Government Relations.

Patent Experts, Small Inventors, and Legal experts: Former directors of the U.S. patent office; Patent Office Professional Association; American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA); Intellectual Property Owners Association (IPO); National Association of Patent Practitioners (NAPP); Judicial Conference, Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure; American Bar Association (ABA).

Investors, Professional Organizations, and Business Groups: National Venture Capital Association; Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO); Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA); Innovation Alliance; Coalition for 21st Century Patent Reform; Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE); U.S. Business & Industry Council; Entrepreneurs for Growth.

Other Organizations: Eagle Forum; Club for Growth; American Conservative Union; Campaign for Liberty; The Weyrich Lunch; CapStand Council for Policy and Ethics.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1853

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 6 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3309, INNOVATION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1105, SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL ACCESS AND JOB PRESERVATION ACT

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–283) on the resolution (H. Res. 429) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3309) to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1105) to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to provide a registration exemption for private equity fund advisers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 4, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3977. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; Transportation Conformity and Conformity of General Federal Actions [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0113; A-1-FRL-9903-21-Region 1] received November 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3978. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Information Reporting of Mortgage Insurance Premiums [TD 9642] (RIN: 1545-BL48) received December 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3979. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Proposed Revision of Procedures for Requesting Competent Authority Assistance Under Tax Treaties [Notice 2013-78] received December 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3980. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; End-Stage Renal Disease Prospective Payment System, Quality Incentive Program, and Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics, and Supplies [CMS-1526-F] (RIN: 0938-AR55) received December 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NUGENT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 429. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3309) to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1105) to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to provide a registration exemption for private equity fund advisers, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–283). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

(Omitted from the Record of December 2, 2013)

H.R. 2810. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than January 10, 2014.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 3633. A bill to clarify that certain recipients of payments from the Federal Government related to the delivery of health care services to individuals shall not be treated as Federal contractors by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs based on the work performed or actions taken by such individuals that resulted in the receipt of such payments; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3634. A bill to make loans and loan guarantees under section 502 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 available for implementing positive train control systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 3635. A bill to ensure the functionality and security of new Federal websites that collect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3636. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise tax on gasoline, diesel, and kerosene fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PERRY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 3637. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to provide whistleblower protection for union employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3638. A bill to establish a Road Usage Fee Pilot Program to study mileage-based fee systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 3639. A bill to eliminate sequestration for the security-related functions, to be offset through reductions in payments under Medicare, agricultural subsidies, federal retirement, and the application of chained CPI, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Oversight and Government Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3640. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the research credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 3641. A bill to require that the workforce of the Environmental Protection Agency be reduced by 15 percent; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Agriculture, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. LEE of California):